

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Nanjunda Swamy S. Jamadagni	Examiner:	Mai Tran
Serial No.:	10/034,689	Group Art Unit:	2129
Filed:	December 28, 2001	Docket:	1488.015US1
Title:	A METHOD OF NETWORK MODELING AND PREDICTIVE EVENT CORRELATION IN A COMMUNICATION SYSTEM BY THE USE OF CONTEXTUAL FUZZY COGNITIVE MAPS		

REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR § 41.41

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

This Reply is presented in response to the Examiner's Answer, dated May 4, 2007, which was sent in answer to Appellant's Appeal Brief, filed on July 12, 2006. Appellant's Appeal Brief was filed in response to the rejection of claims 1-63 of the above-identified application.

Please charge any required additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account 19-0743.

REPLY

In response to the Appellant's argument that Ndousse does not disclose "sampling generated incoming real-time events from the system," the Examiner contends on pages 31-32 of the Examiner's Answer that the last paragraph on page 1558 of Ndousse discloses sampling. The Appellant respectfully disagrees.

The last paragraph on page 1558 of Ndousse states that " $\{f f \dots f\}$ [represents] *the* set of faults or network conditions that could be potentially generated by a typical managed object." (*Emphasis added*). The use of the definitive article "the" indicates that this is indeed not a sample, but an entire collection of the faults in a system. Interestingly, the Examiner on page 32 replaces the definite article with the indefinite article and argues that Ndousse "determines *a* set of faults." The Examiner then rhetorically asks if the Appellant is arguing that Ndousse discloses collecting 100% of all fault data. The Applicant respectfully responds that Ndousse's use of the definitive article indicates that this is indeed the case, and therefore there is no disclosure of sampling in Ndousse. Furthermore, the Examiner's reference to the Wikipedia Fault Management text adds no further light on the matter, because it too, like Ndousse, does not disclose a sample of incoming real time events in a system.

In response to the Appellant's arguments that the claims utilize a computer to form the fuzzy cognitive maps, the Examiner argues on page 32 of the Examiner's Answer that Ndousse discloses a computationally based expert system. However, the Appellant respectfully submits that computational does not necessarily mean processor-based. Indeed, Ndousse illustrates a Fuzzy Cognitive Map (FCM) in Figures 2, 4, and 5, but Ndousse certainly does not disclose how to convert these pictorial representations of FCMs into computer-based code, logic, and/or data structures.

Claim 1 recites the "forming of fuzzy cognitive maps (FCMs) including causally equivalent FCM fragments." In response to the Examiner's contention on pages 34-35 of the Examiner's Answer that Ndousse discloses this limitation at page 1559, left column, lines 36-37, the Appellant pointed out that this cited text of Ndousse does not describe how to create an FCM fragment, but only what it represents. In response the Examiner argues that there is no mention

of these limitations in the claims, and that the specification is not the measure of the invention.

The Appellant respectfully submits that claim 1 clearly recites “forming” FCMs including FCM fragments, and further respectfully submits that the claim does not have to go into the details of the “forming” of the FCMs and the FCM fragments—that is the function of the specification. In short, the claim recites forming FCMs and FCM fragments, and the Ndousse reference does not teach or disclose the formation of such fragments.

In response to the Appellant’s statement that Ndousse teaches nodes as representative of objects and concepts, not events and concepts as claimed, the Examiner on page 40 argues that event nodes read on literal events, but then completely fails to mention anything about what an object node may or may not be. As such, the Examiner has completely failed to rebut the Appellant’s statement. Additionally, in response to the Appellants’ statement that Ndousse lacks a description of identifying concept nodes from the event nodes as claimed, the Examiner on page 41 merely asserts “identifying concept nodes . . . from the determined event nodes . . . “ The Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s answer does not properly rebut the Appellant’s argument. Lastly, in response to the Appellant’s contention that “while Ndousse mentions faults, such faults are not equated to events,” the Examiner states on page 41 that this is a mere conclusory statement that does not convey the Appellant’s rationale such that the Examiner can respond in a meaningful manner. To the extent that it is conclusory, the Appellant stands by that conclusion, that is, that Ndousse fails to disclose that such faults are equated to events.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons outlined in the Appellant's Brief and the Appellant's Reply Brief, the Appellant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the cited references, and respectfully requests a reversal of the Examiner's rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

NANJUNDA SWAMY S. JAMADAGNI

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6972

Date

June 1, 2007

By

David D. Zurilla
Reg. No. 36,776

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 4 day of June 2007.

Name

John D. Busby - Wapell

Signature

John D. Busby - Wapell